AN

ADDRESS

TO HIS GRACE THE

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author being at a diſtance from the preſs, begs leave to offer that Circumſtance, as an apology for the miſtakes and inaccuracies to be found in the firſt impreſſion.

This edition will be more correct; but if errors again creep in, he hopes they will not be imputed to him, as he is ſtill at too great a diſtance to correct it himſelf.

BRITISH MUSEUM

P. 15, l. 7. dele *the*.
29, l. 7. for in read *it*.
46, l. 8. for in read *into*.
59, l. 29. for knowledge read *known*.
64, l. 11. for nor read *and*.
79, l. 3. dele *he may hold*.

to Moore (John)

AN ADDRESS

TO HIS GRACE THE

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,

AS A

VISITOR OF COLLEGES

IN THE

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

AND AS

PRIMATE OF ALL ENGLAND;

THE SECOND EDITION,

WITH A POSTSCRIPT

CONCERNING THE AUTHOR AND OTHER IMPORTANT MATTERS.

By a COUNTRY CLERGYMAN.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR G. G. AND J. ROBINSON, PATERNOSTER-ROW,
AND S. HAZARD, BATH.

MDCCXCI.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AN

ADDRESS, &c.

MY LORD,

I Truſt your Grace will pardon the preſumption of a private clergyman, who comes to you with no other recommendation, than what ariſes from the importance of the ſubjects he propoſes to lay before you. If I am miſtaken in my judgment of things, or if I ſhould treat of them in a light nugatory manner, your Grace will be juſtified in taking no notice of what I ſay; and will throw aſide this addreſs, with the contempt often and juſtly beſtowed on anonymous writers.

It is agreed by all moraliſts, that one of the great bonds of ſociety is the religious regard men pay to oaths. And as your Grace is at the head of the Church of England, and viſitor of the firſt ſeminary of learning in the Univerſity of Oxford, it is incumbent upon you to ſee, as far as in you lies, that due reverence be paid to this moſt

ſacred of all obligations, both by the clergy who are ſubject to your juriſdiction, and by thoſe who are training up under your eye, to fill the moſt important offices in church or ſtate.

When I affirm that the College of All Souls is the firſt college in the Univerſity of Oxford, I do not mean in point of numbers, or revenues, for in thoſe reſpects it is inferiour to many other colleges, but it is become ſo in conſequence of a regular plan laid down for its aggrandizement long ſince the beginning of this century. At its firſt inſtitution, it was upon a level with all other colleges; and enrolled among its members ingenuous youth of all ranks, whom the founder brought together in one ſociety, and commanded them and their ſucceſſors, to live in harmony among themſelves, whatever their pedigree might be, whether high or low, upon pain of incurring the guilt of perjury. *Juro quod comparationes non faciam odioſas, generis ad genus, nobilitatis ad nobilitatem, vel ad ignobilitatem.* This oath is ſtill taken by every member at his admiſſion; but no perſon of mean extraction, whatever his abilities may be, is now admitted a fellow of All Souls College. It is a ſociety compoſed chiefly

chiefly of the younger ſons of the firſt families in the kingdom; a ſociety of gentlemen. They have for ſome time piqued themſelves upon that character; and their elections, of late years eſpecially, have generally ran in that channel. This circumſtance gives a ſplendour to the College of All Souls, to which other foundations are ſtrangers: and I congratulate the Univerſity that ſuch a ſet of gentlemen are incorporated among them, who, under proper regulations, may derive a credit on its diſcipline and be hereafter defenders of its privileges. As an earneſt of which one thing in particular is juſtly expected from them; that in proportion as this ſociety abounds in perſons of high birth and expectations it will abound in dignity of manners; and that their probity will be equal to their ſuperior rank.

I muſt crave pardon of theſe honourable gentlemen, while I inform them, that before their election into this ſociety, a corruption had taken place in it, about the middle of this century, of which I preſume they are ignorant. After the college had been founded more than three hundred years, ſome fruitful genius, who liked his ſituation, and reſolved to continue in it at all hazards,

broached a new interpretation of the ſtatute *de ſociis et ſcholaribus beneficiatis.* By the intention and letter of that ſtatute fairly interpreted, a fellow of All Souls is entitled to hold, together with his fellowſhip, any one ſingle benefice, and no more, of a ſtated value, according to his degree. This value was uſually reckoned, from the *valor* called *Pope Nicolas's,* which obtained in the founder's days; though if the *valor of Henry the Eighth* was more favourable to the perſon who had occaſion to appeal to it, this indulgence had been uſually granted to him. But as *beneficium quodcunque* was in the ſingular number, this gentleman further contended, that he might hold *beneficia quæcunque,* as many as he could procure, provided that the value of each benefice, ſingly taken, did not exceed the value limited by the ſtatute. It was wonderful that this ſociety ſhould have ſubſiſted ſo long, and that it ſhould have been reſerved to this gentleman to have diſcovered a dormant interpretation of a ſtatute, which had been differently conſtrued from the foundation of the college. But the gentleman was in high credit, and the interpretation was too palatable to the taſte of the then members, and too flattering to their intereſts, not to admit of an eaſy reception. The grand ἕυρηκα was

generally

generally applauded among them, and it was agreed to act in conſequence of it; eſpecially as the interpretation was corroborated by the opinion of a celebrated common lawyer of their own body, who pronounced it, as an advocate, genuine and good; though perhaps if he had been called upon, to deliver his opinion upon it from the bench as a judge, he would have been aſhamed to own and patronize ſuch a miſerable quibble.

The interpretation therefore was kept as private as poſſible for ſome time, till the buſineſs had got a little into practice. When it could be no longer concealed, people were at liberty to form their judgment of this new meaſure. Thoughtleſs perſons commended it as an ingenious device to raiſe the conſequence of fellows of colleges in general, which had ſimilar ſtatutes; and to give them a degree of independence, which many of them were not like to obtain by any other method. But ſerious men looked upon the matter in a different light. They lamented the corruption of a plain ſtatute, which they foreſaw would be drawn into precedent by other ſocieties; and they conſidered the abettors of it as having

proſtituted

proſtituted their conſciences, and acted in a direct oppoſition to their oaths.

This diſregard to oaths paſſed next from All Souls to Jeſus College. A new principal being elected there in the year 1768, refuſed to take the oath of celibacy enjoined by the founder, and appealed to the viſitor, a noble layman, to juſtify his refuſal. The noble viſitor did not think proper to aſſume this diſpenſing power without advice. It was a buſineſs quite out of his way, and paſt his comprehenſion. But lawyers were ſuppoſed to be competent judges of it, and to them he referred it. Lawyers of all denominations are generally very dexterous in furniſhing a perplexed client with nice diſtinctions, and plauſible evaſions; but here was no doubtful text upon which to exerciſe their ſubtilties. There was a poſitive law, which ordered the principal elect of Jeſus College, to take an oath of celibacy within a limited time after his election, or the election was to be void, and a new principal choſen. By what arguments therefore they perſuaded the noble viſitor to come into their opinion, I cannot divine. There was in fact no ground for any fair argument at all. But a good-natured viſitor, whoſe deciſions

were

were ſubject to no controul, it was urged, might do what he pleaſed. It was a popular cauſe; it was only reſtoring to a man, the liberty of doing that which by nature he had a right to do, and which could be of prejudice to no other man; and therefore it would be a cruelty to withhold him from the power of doing it. Moved by ſuch falſe arguments the viſitor iſſued his diſpenſing power; a meaſure which, being perſiſted in, coſt one of our Monarchs his crown.

But what is this right of nature, which was pleaded in favour of the principal of Jeſus College? Has not every *fellow* of a college the ſame right of nature, and from his youth a ſtronger propenſity to marry, than a man who has ſucceſsfully combated with his inclinations for a long ſeaſon, and who may be ſuppoſed to have gotten the victory over them? And what withholds ſuch a man from marriage, but the law of his founder, who forbids him to do it, under the penalty of forfeiting his fellowſhip within a few months after he has contracted it.

There was as little truth, as there was juſtice in the plea, that no man was injured by this diſpenſation of the viſitor.

viſitor. Every perſon, eligible to the headſhip of Jeſus College, was injured by it, who would have complied with the requiſition of the founder, in taking the oath of celibacy. And that requiſition the founder had a right to make. The ſtatutes of his college are his laſt will and teſtament, the terms of which are in every man's power; and which law while it is juſtly adminiſtered, will ſtrictly ſupport. If there had been publick virtue enough in Jeſus College, they ought to have petitioned the viſitor in a body againſt this infraction of their ſtatutes, which they had all ſworn to obey. Such a petition would have put the viſitor upon his guard againſt the enſnaring arguments of lawyers, and the honour of the college had been ſaved.

Whenever a man accepts of a benefaction, he has no right to alter the terms of it; he muſt receive it upon the terms of the donor. It is, no doubt, an agreeable thing for a man to be at liberty to marry, if he pleaſes. He has a natural right to do ſo, if he be not ſhackled with engagements to the contrary. To this natural right, moſt other heads of houſes, who were generally required to be prieſts in the days of Popery, were reſtored by the light

of

of the reformation. I congratulate them upon their Chriſtian liberty in this particular. But perhaps if the colleges over which they preſide, had been founded by Proteſtants, they would have been all in the condition of the principal of Jeſus College. I have no doubt in my own mind, that the founder of that ſociety had lived to ſee, the difference there was in the government of colleges before and ſince the reformation. *He that is married*, ſaith a great Authority, *careth for the things of this world, how he may pleaſe his wife.* And doubtleſs a man who has no cares ariſing from a family, will have more leiſure to attend to other cares that are incumbent upon him. But whether the founder of Jeſus College was actuated by that conſideration, or no, in the injunction of celibacy to his head, may be merely my conjecture. That this injunction made a part of his ſtatutes is certain; to the obſervance of which the preſent principal was ſworn at his admiſſion to his fellowſhip. It was therefore no leſs than a breach of his former oath to have heſitated about taking the oath of celibacy, upon his election to the headſhip. I conſidered it in this light at the time of his refuſal; and my opinion has ſince been confirmed by the higheſt authority. THE LORD CHAN-

CELLOR has declared in the Houſe of Lords, that the principal's place in Jeſus College in Oxford is vacant.

Scarce a year had elapſed before a gentleman of Magdalen College, encouraged by theſe examples, and who had obtained a ſecond benefice, incompatible, as the ſociety thought, with his fellowſhip, continued to hold it, contrary to the interpretation of their ſtatutes from the foundation of the college, upon the credit only of the ſame lawyer's opinion, which had given a ſanction to the like practice in All Souls College. The ſociety therefore to their great honour, at a meeting held for that purpoſe, pronounced a ſentence upon him which he deſerved. But they did not do this without hearing him; when having nothing to alledge in his defence but this lawyer's opinion, which they treated as a piece of ſophiſtry, they amoved him from his fellowſhip. He appealed to the viſitor; who reſtored him upon this plea, that *beneficium eccleſiaſticum* being in the ſingular number, and he having no preferment ſeparately taken, above the value limitted by the ſtatute, his fellowſhip ought not to be conſidered as void.

I will

I will not ſcruple to pronounce this an unrighteous decree, void of all *equity*, and unfounded in any *deciſion* at common law, by which it affected to be governed.

It is remarkable that the gentleman in queſtion appealed, as was foreſeen, to the *practice* of All Souls College, which he affirmed had, in this reſpect, exactly the ſame ſtatutes as Magdalen College, and which allowed any two livings to be jointly tenable with a fellowſhip, which would have been tenable ſeparately. He alſo adduced the practice of other colleges as allowing the ſame thing. But that was ſo far from being true, that it was a libel upon the univerſity at large. What other colleges may have done, ſince the decree of the viſitor of Magdalen College in the year 1769, I cannot ſay. At that time the practice was adopted by no other college except All Souls; and that practice was not of many years ſtanding.

Hoc fonte derivata clades.

It is further remarkable, that this viſitor had himſelf been fellow of All Souls College, and therefore muſt

have known, that no ſuch practice obtained in his time; but that on the contrary a viſitatorial injunction had been long in force, that a preferment, *a ſingle preferment* about which the King's books were ſilent, ſhould vacate a fellowſhip there, if it exceeded the clear yearly value of 60£. And yet allured by the idea and reputation of good-nature, in which he certainly excelled, and cajoled and deceived by the opinion of the celebrated common lawyer, who wanted to give a higher ſanction, to the practice, he had been inſtrumental in eſtabliſhing at All Souls, he not only reverſed a ſentence, that will be found to have been given by the ſociety of Magdalen College upon the moſt incontrovertible principles, but arbitrarily reprimanded them for not having conſulted him in the buſineſs which certainly belonged firſt to their own juriſdiction, in which he had no right to interfere, till he was called upon.

About the ſame period this viſitor poiſoned the ſources of a free and liberal education in the College near Wincheſter. By whoſe advice he acted upon this occaſion, I cannot ſay. The caſe was as follows. The governing part of this ſociety conſcious of the liberal maintenance the founder had provided for all the members of it, were

deſirous

deſirous to put a ſtop to the fees, uſually paid to the maſter for inſtruction, by the ſcholars upon the foundation, which they ought not to pay. For this purpoſe they deſigned an addition to his ſalary, as a compenſation for the loſs of the fees he had no right to, and which they intended he ſhould no longer receive. But the maſter, diſſatisfied with the proportion they had aſſigned, or intended to aſſign for that purpoſe, appealed to the viſitor, for relief againſt the reſtriction intended to be laid upon him. He was forbidden by the founder to demand any compenſation for his labour in a variety of terms. The words are *petere*, *exigere*, and *vendicare*. But becauſe the founder had not added the word *recipere*, this able and complaiſant expounder of doubtful caſes, decreed, that *gratuitous preſents* were not contrary to the ſtatute. By which decree he has as effectually marred all claim to a free education in that ſociety for the future, as if the founder had ordered every boy to bring the *gratuitous preſent* now become cuſtomary, and which the maſter preferred to the founder's allotment.

Here then were four caſes very favourable to every member of a college, who could think himſelf at liberty

by

by nice diſtinctions and plauſible evaſions to provide for himſelf in a way more ſuitable to his inclinations, than his founder had provided for him. The firſt indeed leaned upon no better ſupport, than the opinion of a private lawyer, in contradiction to an interpretation of more than three hundred years ſtanding. And the ſecond could not well be drawn into great precedent, becauſe it related to a very particular caſe, and had no firmer ſupport than the acquieſcence of a layman, who profeſſed ignorance in the caſe, and had only ſpoken as the lawyers bade him. But the determination of the two laſt caſes, was an encouragement ſufficient to break down every barrier, by any hand that ſhould be bold enough to attempt the work.

This attempt therefore was made by the late warden of Wadham College; a man of character in other reſpects, but intoxicated, and blinded by the ſucceſsful attempts that had been made, to make waſte paper of old ſtatutes, unfit for the uſe of modern times. His caſe was preciſely the ſame with that of the principal of Jeſus, with this aggravation, that he had once taken the oath of celibacy upon his election to the headſhip, had reſigned it again,

and

and had been elected a ſecond time in the hope to be freed from it by ſome diſpenſing power. But this diſpenſing power, the preſent viſitor the Biſhop of Bath and Wells refuſed to aſſume. He knew the extent of his power, and ſcorned to proſtitute his office. The warden therefore applied to parliament for relief; and to the aſtoniſhment of the multitudes, a bill in his favour had an eaſy paſſage through the Houſe of Commons. But the caſe was not at all underſtood. The general idea that ran through the houſe was, that the warden of Wadham was the only head of a houſe in the Univerſity of Oxford that was reſtrained from marriage, and that it was but juſt to reſtore him to the rights of nature, and to put him upon a level with his brethren; and ſo, without conſideration of any other circumſtances, the bill paſſed the lower houſe.

In the Houſe of Lords it met with the fate it deſerved. If through inadvertency, or want of due information there were any favourers of it upon the right reverend bench, as ſome raſhly and perhaps maliciouſly reported, let them congratulate themſelves, that their bluſhes were ſaved, and their honour guarded by a ſeaſonable interpoſal. In the Name of God, ſuppoſing for argument's

ſake,

ſake, a power veſted in parliament, to ſet aſide the laſt will and teſtament of a man, duly made, atteſted, and publiſhed, which is a legal abſurdity, what power on earth could have abſolved this gentleman from the obligation of the oath he had already taken. *Juro quod matrimonium, non contraham, quam diu gardianus fuero hujus collegii.* He however, and his abettors in the Houſe of Lords, were ſaved from much embarraſſment, by the interpoſal of a brilliant character the greateſt patron of learning, and the firmeſt ſupport of equity, and the eſtabliſhment, this or any other age hath ever known. He, who drew from the obſcurity of a country ſchool, the gentlemanlike tranſlator of the greek drama, and placed him in the Church of Norwich; who gave a ſtall at Wincheſter to that elegant ſcholar Dr. Warton, and another at Gloceſter to Mr. Profeſſor White; who placed that eminent mathematician and divine Dr. Horſley upon the bench of biſhops, ſolely on account of their literary merits; he, who in a time of trial, interpoſed his authority to defend the perſon of the King, and the conſtitution of this country, THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND took up this matter with dignity, pronounced his manly *VETO*, and the whole buſineſs diſſolved into air.

There

There is a corruption of another kind, which I cannot refrain mentioning on this occaſion. Since my remembrance, there have been four inſtances of fellows of colleges in the Univerſity of Oxford, who have ſat in the Houſe of Commons. The firſt could fairly plead, that he had a right to hold both places, becauſe he was the eldeſt ſon of a father poſſeſſed of 600*£*. a year freehold eſtate. The ſecond alſo had a right to hold his fellowſhip, but he had no legal qualification for a ſeat in the ſenate. The third and fourth doubtleſs had a right to ſit there, for according to a late law of this country, they regiſtered their qualifications and ſwore to them. But if they were qualified to ſit in the Houſe of Commons, they had no longer any right to hold their fellowſhips, unleſs their ſeveral qualifications conſiſted of leaſehold property for a term of years only, which I am credibly informed is not the caſe of either of them. Theſe gentlemen are, both of them, ſtill fellows of colleges ſubject to your Grace's viſitation, with whom it lies to remedy the abuſe, and remove the ſcandal.

I have no pleaſure in fixing a ſtigma on the corruptors, or evaders of college ſtatutes; my view is only to ſtem

the torrent of corruption. I have therefore been cautious of mentioning any perſon by name. Some of thoſe alluded to muſt neceſſarily be known within a certain circle, and others probably gueſſed at. But moſt of them are dead; and thoſe who are living, I hope, will be admoniſhed and repent of their obliquities. But it muſt be allowed that I have mentioned ſome things worthy to be rectified. *Becauſe of ſwearing the land mourneth.* And whether the Name of God be wantonly blaſphemed in common converſation, or by trifling with the ſacred obligation of an oath deliberately taken, it is a crime of a very deep dye. With reſpect to eccleſiaſtical perſons, and preferments, it may imply a hardſhip, if any gentleman in any college ſubject to your Grace's viſitation, ſhould be diſpoſſeſſed of his fellowſhip, on account of having tranſgreſſed the ſtatute with precedents before him. Let the practice, however ſhort, juſtify him. Upon diſpoſſeſſing himſelf of his ſecond benefice, he may again become *rectus in curiâ.* The Lord Chancellor has ſet a noble example in this reſpect. He has ſhewn, in the inſtance of the principal of Jeſus College, how little credit ought to be given to an advocate pleading for his client. Happy thoſe who diſdain, like him, to liſten to accommodating ſenſes,

to

to nice diſtinctions, and ingenious ſubtilties; who ſift truth from falſehood. A ſimilar example in your Grace will be followed, by thoſe other biſhops who are viſitors of colleges in either univerſity; and the plan of reformation will be regularly purſued under the influence, that ought to cheriſh it. It will come recommended too by the addreſs with which it will be made. Your Grace has long lived among the great, and your manners are as poliſhed, as if you had been born and bred in a court. May the dignity and probity with which you diſcharge the important truſt of a viſitor, keep pace with your politeneſs, and convince the world, that poets, hiſtorians, and philoſophers have not written in vain, when they pronounced, that Virtue alone is true nobility.

I have other things to mention of much higher conſequence, and which I find myſelf under a kind of impulſe, to write upon, and recommend. I hope they may find a gracious acceptance, and merit your pardon at leaſt, if they do not meet with your approbation.

The firſt is a Reviſal of the Articles and Liturgy of the Church; a work that has been long and repeatedly

called for in vain, but the neceſſity of which appears more and more every day. I am happy to ſee upon the bench, three prelates, who, while they were in inferior ſtations, profeſſed themſelves friends to ſuch a meaſure. Their aſſiſtance I preſume may be depended upon. It will be difficult, and even impoſſible, to ſatisfy the expectations, of all who wiſh for an alteration, and therefore it will be in vain to attempt it. Much leſs ſhould this buſineſs be ſet about, by a conference with Diſſenters of any denomination. When men have lived long in a ſtate of ſeparation, been bred up in different principles, and attached to different forms, they do not eaſily coaleſce, by going over the old debatable ground. There is no end of aſking on one ſide, or conceding on the other. The Church ſhould have the dignity to reform itſelf, and ſo enlarge the terms of her communion, as to invite by true chriſtian moderation, the greateſt numbers of all who are named by the Name of Chriſt, to unite in one common form of worſhip.

This is eſpecially neceſſary to be attempted at preſent; for notwithſtanding all the learned pains that have been taken to confirm the youth of the univerſity, in the orthodox

thodox doctrine, as it is called, of the Church of England, I am well informed that they have profited much more from the doctrine of evaſions, ſo ſucceſsfully propagated throughout all colleges. They do not ſcruple to profeſs openly, in large numbers, their diſapprobation of the Athanaſian creed, and their reſolution never to make uſe of it. "We conſider the ſubſcription," ſay they, "as "an engagement impoſed upon us, by our governors in "church and ſtate, not to diſturb the publick peace, by "writing, or preaching upon ſuch an abſtruſe ſubject; "and ſo far, and no farther, we think ourſelves bound "ſilently to conform to it by ſubſcription."

It muſt be allowed, my Lord, that this is an *age of refinement;* and perhaps under theſe open and candid declarations the youths are not much to blame. But it is a pity to throw ſuch a ſtumbling block in the way to the miniſtry, which will only inure them to prevaricate through life. To ſpeak in the imperfection of human language, I think that I worſhip one God in trinity, with as much ſincerity as any clergyman of the eſtabliſhed church. And yet I wiſh in the ſpirit and words of Archbiſhop Tillotſon that the church was well rid of this ſame creed.

If

If that great prelate had lived many years in his high ſtation, it is probable he would have attempted to bring this great point to bear. And under the patronage and conduct of ſo eminent and ſound a divine, aſſiſted by other great men of ſimilar diſpoſitions, it is likely that his attempt would have been crowned with ſucceſs. But he died too ſoon; and no great leader has been ſince found, who thought himſelf equal to the taſk, which it muſt be owned, is a difficult one. But the grand difficulty lies chiefly in the imagination, and the inveteracy of old habits and principles we have been brought up in. For ſurely the doctrine of the Trinity does not depend on the Athanaſian creed. The name and attributes of God are given diſtinctly in the holy Scriptures, to the three perſons in the Godhead. We are baptized in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. This is the God whom Chriſtians worſhip, and to whoſe ſervice they are devoted. If therefore the doctrine of the Trinity cannot be ſupported by ſcripture alone, it muſt fall to the ground; the Athanaſian creed cannot ſupport it. It is a human fabrication concerning an incomprehenſible doctrine, and therefore muſt be imperfect. It conſiſts of a pretty jingle of ſcholaſtic terms, with which

I was

I was infinitely pleaſed while I was a young man; but I have ſince conſidered it as abounding in unſcriptural terms and abſurdities; and the damnatory clauſes are quite inconſiſtent with the mild ſpirit of Chriſtianity. Yet many learned and good men have been and are of a contrary opinion; among which is a gentleman who was an excellent ſcholar but not much known, on account of his modeſty, and the obſcurity of his rank in the church; Dr. Horbery, a canon in the cathedral Church of Litchfield. This gentleman in my time was a celebrated preacher in the univerſity, though by no means a frequent one; his modeſty as I have before hinted, being ſo great as to throw a ſhade over his other virtues, and abilities, which were eminent. After his death a volume of his ſermons was publiſhed from original manuſcripts; the laſt of which is profeſſedly in defence of the Athanaſian creed. I ſhall beg leave to quote a paſſage or two from theſe ſermons which I ſhall make a kind of text to what I ſhall farther remark upon this celebrated creed.

In the ſermon on Chriſtmas-day, page 127, is the following paſſage. "Adam and other men are ſometimes "called *ſons of God*; and yet we never think of aſcribing "any

" any proper divinity to them, ſince the title is ſufficiently
" accounted for by their creation, or adoption. But in
" the caſe before us, we muſt go further; becauſe the
" ſame holy writings ſpeak of one, who is the Son of
" God in a far more tranſcendent and peculiar manner;
" of one who is *his well-beloved*, his *only*, and *his only-be-*
" *gotten Son.*" A little lower it is ſaid, " It is plain from
" ſcripture, that he had an exiſtence antecedent to his in-
" carnation. In what capacity then, and under what re-
" lation? Was he co-ordinate with the Father, equally
" underived and unoriginate? This will not be aſſerted.
" Was he then made or created? Nor ſhould this: be-
" cauſe the ſcriptures declare, that all things were made
" by him, and that without him was not any thing made
" that was made: he therefore could not be made at all,
" unleſs his agency was concerned in his own creation,
" which is an abſurdity, which may be reſolved into an
" expreſs contradiction. If then he was neither made,
" nor created, but ſubſiſted with the Father before all
" time, and all creation; and yet was not, like him, ab-
" ſolutely underived, ſelf-exiſtent, and of none; it muſt
" follow that he proceeded in ſome ineffable and myſteri-
" ous manner from the Father; or in the catholic lan-
" guage,

" guage, that he was begotten of him. That paſſage in-
" deed in the epiſtle to the Coloſſians, which we render
" *the firſt-born of every creature*, if it ſhould be tranſlated,
" as ſome learned men contend, *born*, or *begotten before*
" *all creation*, will ſufficiently prove our Saviour's divine
" and eternal ſonſhip. And the context ſeems to deter-
" mine it in this ſenſe, as it there immediately follows,
" that *all things were created by him;* which is given as a
" proof of his antecedent generation: and it is likewiſe
" expreſsly added that *he is before all things;* which, com-
" pared with the other, ſeems to point out not only his
" eternal exiſtence, but the very manner of it, viz. by
" generation. Suppoſe then that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son
" of God, not merely with regard to any temporal acts
" or offices, but with reſpect to the incomprehenſible
" manner of his deriving his nature from him, and ſee
" how the caſe will ſtand in order to evince his true divi-
" nity. Father and Son are terms, which we eaſily un-
" derſtand, when applied to human perſons; and when
" applied to the divine, we muſt, in a great meaſure, re-
" tain the ſame human ideas, or we ſhould have none at
" all. We cannot think that this ſort of language was
" taken up accidentally, and by chance; but that it was

" purpoſely deſigned, to convey to us, under the images " of this human relation, the real correſpondent relation " between God the Father, and God the Son. If the " Father begot the Son, he begot him of his own ſub- " ſtance; and ſince the divine ſubſtance cannot be di- " vided, he muſt communicate to him the whole undi- " vided ſubſtance of the godhead; and by conſequence " the Son muſt have, equally with the Father, all the " powers and perfections of it. It is ſo with men; the " ſon is equal to his father, in all the eſſentials of hu- " man nature. And to ſay, that Jeſus Chriſt in his high- " eſt capacity, is the Son of God, and yet of a different " and inferiour nature, is the very ſame abſurdity in kind, " though much greater in degree, as if we were to call a " creature of the irrational ſpecies, a ſon of man. The " Son of God then is God, as every ſon of man is man. " If the uniform language of ſcripture does not teach us " this, it teaches us nothing; all faith, all myſtery, will " be reſolved into figure, into metaphor, into bare allu- " ſion." A little lower he ſays, " Our modern Arians " talk with infinite abſurdity and confuſion upon this ſub- " ject: they will tell us that the Son is like the Father, " *altogether like* the Father, and *like him in all things*, and

" yet

" yet while they make him of a different and inferiour " nature, they can give no ſatisfactory account in what " this likeneſs conſiſts."

I ſubſcribe cordially to what this orthodox doctor here ſays; but I do not ſubſcribe to what he advances in his ſermon upon the Athanaſian creed, that "it is the great "bulwark and preſervative of the catholic faith." On the contrary, by following his own argument it will appear, that it tends to the confuſion of it. For if God the Son be derived from God the Father, he muſt be poſterior in point of time to God the Father, though, in the language of the Nicene creed, he is "God of God, light of light, "very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of "one ſubſtance with the Father." The ſame muſt be aſſerted concerning God the Holy Ghoſt, "who proceed- "eth from the Father and the Son." God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt therefore cannot be co-eternal with God the Father, from whom they are derived. "If "the uniform language of ſcripture does not teach us this "it teaches us nothing." We muſt at once give up all pretentions to its divine inſpiration, and with the Socinians, melt down chriſtianity into a more refined kind

of deiſm. Here let the faithful Trinitarian take his ſtand. I will not advance one ſtep further, leſt ſome bold zealot ſhould come forward and call me HERETIC. But I will repeat what in ſubſtance I ſaid before, that ſcripture uniformly teaches me, that there are three perſons in the godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt. And as reaſon unites with revelation in aſſuring me, that there can be but one God; I therefore worſhip Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt in unity.

A chaplain of Dr. Chandler, formerly Biſhop of Durham, once told me, that ſoon after his introduction into the family, he read prayers in his Lordſhip's private chapel on a holy-day, when the Athanaſian creed was appointed to be read, which he read in its place. When prayers were over the Biſhop reproved him haſtily and angrily for doing it. *Why did you read that ſtrange creed?* The good principles of this great prelate, and able writer in the cauſe of chriſtianity cannot be doubted. The truth probably was, that he had ſincerely ſubſcribed to this creed in his younger years, which his maturer judgment diſapproved. It has been the caſe, I believe of hundreds and thouſands ſince. I have hardly met a brother-

ther-clergyman of gravity and reputation, who has read it for many years. It is indeed magnificently chanted by choiriſters, in our cathedral and collegiate churches and chapels, but many of the ſuperiour part of the congregation, moſt of the clergy included, ſhut their mouths while it is repeated, or ſhew more open tokens of their diſlike of it. What therefore is fallen into ſuch general diſuſe it is time to purge away; and candid men will be the more ready to join in the removal of this ſtumbling-block, becauſe the rejection of this creed, with a few more trifling alterations connected with it, would probably bring a large body of ſincere Chriſtians into communion with the eſtabliſhed church.

One neceſſary alteration connected with this is, either to omit the deſcent into hell in the Apoſtles creed, and ſuffer the article to ſtand as it does in the Nicene creed; or to alter the phraſe of the article and render in intelligible to the common people.

Divines are infinitely puzzled, how to explain the deſcent into hell; and after all their voluminous writings upon the occaſion, the ſubſtance of what they have to

ſay,

ſay, may be compriſed in a ſhort compaſs. They obſerve that the word *hell* ſometimes denotes the place of the damned, wherein they are to undergo the puniſhment allotted them by the righteous judgments of God. Sometimes it ſignifies the grave only. But in the creed it cannot be taken for the place of torments, becauſe Chriſt finiſhed all his ſufferings upon the croſs, and had nothing further to undergo. Neither can it ſignify the grave only; for of the burial of Chriſt's body there was mention before, and a ſoul cannot go into the grave. Beſides, whenever the place of torment is ſpoken of, the word *hell* in the original is always *gehennah*, but when only the ſtate of the dead in general is intended, it is always expreſſed by a different word, *hades*. And therefore they add, that it is at leaſt very ſafe, and very ſufficient to underſtand theſe words to ſignify no more than this: that as our bleſſed Lord was actually dead and buried, ſo he continued ſome time in that ſtate; his body being laid and remaining in the grave, and his ſoul being all that time ſeparate from it, and continuing in the ſame ſtate as thoſe of good men will do during the time of their ſeparation. But this latter is not only a *ſafe*, but ſeems to be the *only proper interpretation* of this article; which is abſolutely

abſolutely confirmed by comparing two remarkable paſſages of holy ſcripture together.

When Chriſt was expiring upon the croſs, he ſaid to the penitent thief, To-day ſhalt thou be with me in paradiſe. What our bleſſed Saviour expreſſes by *paradiſe*, St. Peter from the authority of the Pſalms expreſſes by the word hell, (*hades*) uſed in the creed. "Men and "brethren, let me freely ſpeak unto you of the patri-"arch David, that he is both dead and buried.—There-"fore being a prophet, and knowing that God had ſworn "to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the "fleſh, he would raiſe up Chriſt to ſit on his throne, he, "ſeeing this before, ſpake of the reſurrection of Chriſt, "that his ſoul was not left in hell, (*hades*) neither his "fleſh did ſee corruption." (Acts ii. 29.) The hell therefore (*hades*) and paradiſe to which our bleſſed Saviour and the penitent thief went on the day of their crucifiction, mean the ſame thing; viz. the place, and the ſtate in which the righteous after death continue, till the day of the reſurrection, and final conſummation of all things.

Theſe

Theſe two paſſages thus brought together, tend to illuſtrate the doctrine of the ſeparate ſtate, ſo ably treated by the late Biſhop of Carliſle; and help out the only lame part of his argument. I have often wonder'd that ſuch a fine reaſoner, and ſo good a ſcholar could be contented with an interpretation ſo jejune and forced as that he has adopted, of the words Λέγω σοι, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ. He has tranſpoſed the comma to σήμερον, and tranſlated it thus, I ſay unto thee to-day—thou ſhalt be with me in paradiſe, "To-day thou art certain of a place with me in "heaven; 'tis a thing already done and determined." It ſhews that the text pinched him; and as he could not tell how to get rid of it in its plain and natural ſenſe, his ingenuity was employed, and his invention racked (ſuch is the nature of man in his beſt purſuits) to make it bend to his own hypotheſis, of the truth of which he was fully perſuaded by other irrefragable proofs.

As different men have different ways of expreſſing their ideas on the ſame ſubject, I beg leave, notwithſtanding all that has been advanced by the learned prelate, and others, upon ſo important an argument, to offer my opinion upon it in my own words.

The

The ſentence, " Thou ſhalt ſurely die, includes in it, according to my apprehenſion, the diſſolution or death of the whole man, ſoul and body. The two component parts make but one man, and the ſentence as it ſhould ſeem, can never be executed, unleſs both parts are equally affected. But this agrees not with the received notion of the nature of the ſoul. The ſoul, it is ſaid, is immortal and cannot die. But why not? It is not naturally immortal. Immortality is purely the gift of God. Nothing is naturally immortal, that is not ſelf-exiſtent; and conſequently the higheſt angelic natures may again be reduced to nothing, if it ſhall ſo pleaſe him, who formed them. The ſoul of man in particular was not originally deſigned to be more immortal than his body. They were both joined together at his firſt formation, and would have exiſted entire together to eternity, if man had not forfeited his title to that eternity by his diſobedience. When he fell, he fell therefore in his whole nature. One part could not be puniſhed without the other, becauſe both together make up but one idea, one individual man. Of this individual, (if we muſt diſtinguiſh its parts) it was *the ſoul that ſinned.* The body, or matter is incapable of offence. The ſoul drew after it the deſtruc-

tion of its companion, or vehicle, the body, but could not ſubſtitute *that* to be puniſhed *alone*, in the room of *itſelf*, which was the offending part. This is the language of reaſon, founded upon the light of ſcripture, which ſpeaks very intelligibly, though briefly, of the nature of man.

The contrary opinion conſiders body and ſoul as two diſtinct *natures*, not as two component *principles* of one man. And this opinion has received great ſupport from pride and falſe philoſophy. The wiſer heathens led partly by obſcure tradition of man's immortality, partly by their obſervation of the powers of the human mind, and experiencing the periſhing nature of their material part, put the body quite out of the queſtion, and concluded, that the mind, or ſoul only was the man. There was ſomething very ingenious and plauſible in their manner of reaſoning. They concluded juſtly, that matter was incapable of thought, and that what *was* capable of it muſt be a principle eſſentially different from it; and from the immateriality of the ſoul, for want of better light, they eaſily infered its *natural* immortality. But herein they erred, in that they knew not, as we do, that

immortality

immortality is the gift of God. It was his original gift to body and ſoul at his firſt creation, (for by ſin only came death into the world) and it will again be his gift at the reſurrection, by the redemption of our bleſſed Lord. But, till the reſurrection, the man is diſſolved. One component part goes to the earth, from whence it was; the ſpirit, or breath of life, returns to the keeping of God who gave it; who will at the laſt day remand it back to the body, and will give both parts thus re-united a freſh conſciouſneſs in a glorified ſtate.

This account magnifies the bleſſing of our redemption. If our ſouls can exiſt ſeparately, and are ſenſible of happineſs, or miſery, as ſoon as they are diſlodged from the body, it ſeems a purchaſe unworthy of the ſacrifice of the death of Chriſt, to redeem our earthy parts from the grave. They, upon this ſuppoſition, can add nothing to our conſciouſneſs, and the ſoul, according to the heathen notion of it, is the whole man: and why the uſeleſs body ſhould be raiſed at ſuch an infinite expence as the blood of Chriſt, ſeems inconceivable. But if the man be divided, if the ſoul be in one place, and the body in another, both confounded, diſſolved, unconſcious, dead, (call it

what you will) the act that ſhall unite and re-animate them again, will be a bleſſing indeed, and the ſubject of endleſs gratitude and praiſe to God who will give us the victory through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

I have the more ſatisfaction in this belief as it reconciles a difficulty which has often puzzled very good men. Matter and ſpirit, it is generally agreed, are eſſentially different. But if from the immateriality of ſpirit, we infer its *natural immortality*, what is to become of the ſpirits of the brute creation? Are they alſo immortal? Human philoſophy, if it will be conſiſtent, muſt maintain the affirmative ſide of the queſtion; but the pride of man revolts at the humbling idea of being levelled with the brutes. Piety, not ſtaggered at the objection, humbly replies, Leave the matter to almighty God. He, who, at the beginning of the creation, gave immortality to man's nature, and will reſtore it again in Chriſt, may alſo give it to what beings he pleaſes. Revelation ſays, that man ſhall live forever, through the ſatisfaction of Chriſt; but it no where ſays, that the meaneſt inſect ſhall do ſo.

An agreement in this truth would have prevented much animoſity between two great men, Locke and Stillingfleet. Locke, to account for the reflection and ſoul of brutes, aſſerted, that "it implied no contradiction, "that God might ſo finely organize matter as to make it "capable of thinking." Stillingfleet foreſaw the ill tendency of this opinion, and was juſtly offended at it, as leading directly to materialiſm. He maintained therefore the immateriality of ſpirit, the diſtinct nature of the human ſoul, and its *natural immortality*. The philoſopher to magnify the power of God, annexed an unphiloſophical idea to matter; and the divine, afraid of infidelity, magnified the human ſoul beyond its original. Both might have accorded upon theſe acknowledged principles. Matter and ſpirit are eſſentially different. Brutes may have ſpirits without their being immortal, becauſe immortality, though we know it belongs to man, belongs to him only as the gift of God.

To return from this digreſſion. The Athanaſian creed being parted with, and that of the Apoſtles being abridged of a few words, or the mode of expreſſion varied, a way will be opened to eſtabliſh the genuine doctrines of revelation

revelation, the death of mankind univerſally as the puniſhment of ſin, and their reſtoration to life and immortality by the ſacrifice of the Redeemer.

The Liturgy, in other reſpects, will want but very few corrections, to render it acceptable to ſober Chriſtians of almoſt every denomination. But ſome alterations there muſt be in the callendar, and a different mode of reading the offices muſt take place, to avoid offending God and our neighbour by much ſpeaking and vain repetitions. Till ſome better plan be adopted, I beg leave to ſubmit the following to your Grace's conſideration.

The firſt leſſons ſhould undergo a thorough alteration, that nothing be read in the church that does not tend to general edification.

The morning and evening prayers ſhould remain nearly as they do, and not a word be altered in any of our excellent collects.

On thoſe days, (Sundays and holy-days excepted) when the Litany is appointed to be read, it ſhould follow

low immediately after theſe ſuffrages at the end of the creed.

Miniſter. The Lord be with you.

Anſwer. And with thy ſpirit.

Min. Let us pray.

" O God the Father of heaven," *&c.* to the end.

As three diſtinct ſervices are crouded together on every Sunday, and holy-day in the morning, to the offence of many Chriſtians, they ſhould be kept as ſeparate as poſſible, after ſome ſuch method as the following.

On theſe mornings, the common prayer, (omitting the Apoſtles creed) ſhould be read to the end of theſe two ſuffrages,

Prieſt. O God, make clean our hearts within us.

Anſw. And take not thy Holy Spirit from us.

Then may follow the ſecond collect for peace, and the third for grace; omitting in this place the collect for the day, which will be uſed immediately before the epiſtle and goſpel. Then, as one continued office, ſhould follow the collect at the communion, " Almighty God,

" to

" to whom all hearts be open," the commandments and reſponſes, one of the collects for the King, the prayer for the church militant, tranſpoſed hither; then the collect, epiſtle and goſpel for the day, and the Nicene creed.

After the Nicene creed a pſalm, or anthem.

Then the ſermon; and the whole duty for the morning to be concluded by the bleſſing to be pronounced by the miniſter from the pulpit, or by the biſhop if he be preſent.

If there be a celebration of the holy communion, it may go on, as it does at preſent after the ſermon.

Upon all ſtate holy days, ſuch collects and prayers may be added to the uſual form, as ſhall be thought proper; but the Litany on thoſe mornings, ſhould be wholly omitted.

On Aſh-Wedneſday, proper leſſons ſhould be appointed; the common ſervice read to the end of the Apoſtles creed, to be followed by the commination only.

Evening

Evening prayer ſhould be the ſame throughout the year, except on the evenings of Sundays, and holy-days, when after the ſuffrages,

Miniſter. The Lord be with you.

Anſwer. And with thy ſpirit.

The Litany, "O God the Father of heaven," *&c.* ſhould follow and conclude it.

By this method the whole of our excellent Liturgy will be read in courſe, without doing violence to any part of it. And the Litany will become more familiar than it is to the common people, who cannot attend it on the week-days, and who on Sundays more generally reſort to the evening ſervice, than to that of the morning.

Baptiſm ſhould always be adminiſtered after the ſecond leſſon, on account of the excellent office which accompanies it. The prayers, and all the other parts of it are ſo divinely penned, that I never adminiſter it, without being warmed by it: and I have obſerved that the congregation is generally moſt attentive, whom it is calculated to inſtruct, and edify, more than the beſt ſermon.

If any one ſhould be offended at the ſign of the croſs, as ſuperſtitious, though it be accompanied with one of the moſt ſolemn chriſtian declarations ever penned, the uſe of that ceremony, in compliance with the ſcruples of our chriſtian brethren, may be omitted, whenever the parents of the child require it.

Though the church adheres to the practice of infant baptiſm, it has provided an office for that of adults, which many ſound divines have thought preferable. And it orders too that the baptized perſon ſhall be *dipped* in the water, ſhould he prefer that mode to ſprinkling. A baptiſtery therefore ſhould be provided in every church, that ſuch adult perſons as chooſe to receive baptiſm by immerſion, may receive it in that manner, which is undoubtedly the moſt ancient. In the mean time they ſhould have free admittance into the church as catechumens, after having been ſimply named without ſponſors, or any other ceremony, in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt; in token that they are born of chriſtian parents, and entitled to be brought up in all the privileges of Chriſtianity.

The

The Articles ſhould undergo a thorough reviſal and reform, if it were only on this account that they were written by fallible men. The latter part of the nineteenth article has theſe words. " As the Church of Je-" ruſalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, ſo alſo " the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living " and manner of ceremonies, but alſo in matters of faith." And is it not poſſible that the Church of England may have erred too? She certainly has erred, though perhaps with the beſt intention in the world. Her deſign in the Articles was to accommodate herſelf to many of different perſuaſions, to frame them in ſuch a manner as to draw the greateſt numbers poſſible into her communion, while the minds of men were heated, and not well ſettled in their religious principles. Hence it happens, that they lean ſo ſtrongly to the abſurdities, not to ſay the blaſphemies of Calviniſm; ſo ſtrongly, that it is a favourite topic with our modern Calviniſts, or Methodiſts as they are called, to reproach the clergy of the eſtabliſhed church, with having departed from their principles, and turned their backs upon the true doctrine, which they only preach. It is high time therefore upon the ſame conciliating principles which actuated our forefathers, to reform

theſe Articles; to make them as general as poſſible, that all true Chriſtians may ſubſcribe to them who acknowledge the divine inſpiration of the New teſtament, and who worſhip one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; though they pretend not to define, and comprehend, what all acknowledge to be incomprehenſible, the manner how the divine eſſence and power is participated between the three perſons.

When the offices of religion are duly regulated, they ſhould be reverendly performed, and a good example ſet by the ſuperiour clergy. I have been in holy orders more than forty years, twenty-eight of which I have paſſed in reſidence in a country pariſh; during which time I have been at only three confirmations of which I will give the hiſtory.

The firſt was, when I was a curate; in which ſtation I ſpent the firſt eight years after my ordination. A foreign biſhop came to confirm, in a dioceſe where confirmation had not been adminiſtered for ten years paſt. There was a great tumult in the church, which viſibly diſtreſſed the officiating biſhop, who was a man of dignity, and of a truly

truly chriſtian and apoſtolic ſpirit. He performed his part of the ceremony with a becoming decency and gravity, laying his hands ſeverally upon the head of every perſon to be confirmed. A brother curate and myſelf were the only parochial clergymen preſent, and we endeavoured as much as poſſible to preſerve order, by guarding the narrow paſſage which led to the chancel. But as we were not equal to the work, on account of the crowd, the chaplain of the dioceſan who attended, came to aſſiſt us. He thought to have regulated this tumultuous aſſembly by the authoritative tone in which he commanded *order, ſilence.* But, as the mob did not immediately obey; this *decent* gentleman marked one of thoſe who preſſed forward with moſt eagerneſs, in the crowd, took his peruke from his head, and caſt it from him. There was noiſe and indecency enough before, and this action turned the church into a perfect bear-garden.

At the ſecond confirmation I attended, I was the only parochial clergyman preſent: and I afterwards found I might have ſaved myſelf that trouble. It was conducted in the following manner. When as many candidates were

were placed before the communion rail, as it was capable of holding, the attending chaplain, in a kind of half-whiſper, gave the word of command. *Lay your heads cloſe together.* But as the youths had not been previouſly diſciplined, they ſeemed not to underſtand what it was that was required of them. The chaplain therefore aſſiſted in bringing the heads, not without violence, ſome to the right hand, and ſome to the left, in cloſe contact. By which means the biſhop, ſpreading out the fingers of each hand, touched four heads at a time. And as he and his chaplain became more practiſed, they were ſometimes happy enough to bring three heads into a kind of triangular poſition, and ſo diſpatched five, or, if they were extraordinarily lucky, ſix perſons at a time. It was indeed a moſt indecent ſcene, and I turned from it in diſguſt. But there was ſome reaſon for all this haſte; for after the ceremony was over, there was a viſitation of the clergy of the deanry.

The third ceremony of this kind was conducted in a different manner. A foreign biſhop attended in the room of the biſhop of the dioceſe, more inclined to decorum. I thought it my duty to be preſent, but was informed,

formed, when I came, that I was not expected; and ever ſince that time, I have never attempted to obtrude myſelf upon ſimilar occaſions. The number to be confirmed was only from a few pariſhes, and order and ſilence were well kept. About twenty perſons kneeled before the biſhop at a time; and he in ſilence laid his hands upon the head of each of them, till he came to the end of the rank; when paſſing to the middle of the communion-rail, he extended his hands, and pronounced the bleſſing upon them with a becoming ſolemnity. This was ſo different from the diſſorder of the two former confirmations, that, comparatively ſpeaking, I was in raptures with it. And yet I conceive even this method of confirming is neither agreeable to former practice nor to the order of the church. All that is gotten by this haſte, is the ſaving of a little trouble; twenty perſons being almoſt as ſoon confirmed as two. But as the biſhop would not give the vicar of the pariſh the trouble of reading prayers before the ceremony began, nor the clergy the trouble of attending, it was very conſiſtent to ſave himſelf as much trouble as poſſible. But how comes the diſcharge of any part of the epiſcopal office to be conſidered as a trouble? If biſhops would confirm frequently, and in populous

places

places parochially, with ſolemnity in the face of the congregation, after the celebration of divine ſervice, and ſurrounded by their clergy, ſuch a venerable appearance would do credit to religion, and conciliate reſpect and affection to their perſons and office. Whereas all this haſte to get rid of trouble, and privately to perform a mere *opus operatum*, tends to lower them individually, and to leſſen the dignity of the epiſcopal character.

Viſitations are as eaſily paſſed over. Once in three years the biſhop dines familiarly with his clergy in their reſpective deanries; of moſt of whom he knows little more than their names, which have been previouſly called over at the church. There they hear a charge perhaps on the duty of reſidence; the laſt ſubject moſt biſhops ſhould chooſe. I believe no friend to the conſtitution deſires to deprive them of their votes in parliament. But why do they leave their dioceſes before the parliament meets? Or rather, why do they not, except upon emergent occaſions, reſide upon their dioceſes entirely, and leave their proxy with your Grace, or the Biſhop of London, whoſe reſidence is always near the court, and parliament? Alas! they deſire no ſuch deputies. London is the ſcene

they

delight in. When the ſummer is far advanced, the biſhop retires to his dioceſe, juſt as a temporal lord, or great commoner, retires to his country ſeat. When he is there, he behaves with great affability and politeneſs, to all with whom he has any concern; ſuch as might be expected from a man of good breeding, and good morals. But his clergy, as ſuch, take up no more of his concern than other men. And thus having ſlipt through the neceſſary duties of his office as expeditiouſly as poſſible, at the approach of winter he haſtens to the capital, whether parliament be ſitting or not, to enjoy at his eaſe, the emoluments of his high ſtation, and to mix with the faſhionable world in the purſuit of his pleaſure, and intereſts.

The decent face which religion wears in the country is not owing to the ſuperintending care of biſhops or great pluraliſts. It is owing in the firſt place, to the regular inſtruction, and laudable example of the reſident parochial clergy; to the exertions of the laborious curate, who on Sundays hurries from church to church with the diligence and expedition of a poſt-boy; and carries the tidings of ſalvation, recommended, and enforced in his beſt manner, to two or three different and diſtant con-

gregations; for which if the duty of each be ſeparately eſtimated by the week, he frequently receives a pay inferiour to that of a day-labourer. It is owing alſo, in part, to the preaching and example of regularly ordained Diſſenters, who are ſeldom wanting in a pious zeal to keep up the credit of their reſpective ſects. And laſtly, it is not a little owing to the numerous ſeminaries of Lady Huntingdon and Mr. Weſley. With whatever high and bold pretentions theſe ſects were at firſt eſtabliſhed, they have abated much of them; and their followers are now chiefly diſtinguiſhed for their zeal, which at firſt awakened, and ſtill keeps up a ſenſe of religion, among the lower ranks of mankind eſpecially. Credible reports of their good doctrine in general frequently come to my ears; but I do not entirely truſt to them, I chooſe to judge for myſelf. I once heard at Lady Huntingdon's chapel in Bath, a youth of nineteen, habited like a clergyman, deliver from his memory a precompoſed diſcourſe, which would have done honour to a regular divine. At other times I have attended thoſe who have been eſteemed the great luminaries of that congregation. With their *manner* I have been much offended; but their *matter* was ſuch as a chriſtian ear might hear to edification.

tion. In Mr. Weſley's chapel I once heard a decent collier pray, and deliver an extempore harangue from a choſen text, which ſeemed to make a great impreſſion upon his audience. His doctrine was ſound, and his manner unaffected.

I have often wondered when I was a young man, long before I was a prieſt, that any of your Grace's order ſhould think they were ſerving God, by refuſing to admit into holy orders any one ſuſpected of Methodiſm. At that time I had no juſt idea of the meaning of the term, but obſerving that their manners were pure, and their profeſſions diſintereſted, I thought even then, the advice of Gamaliel, with reſpect to the Apoſtles, had better been adopted, *Refrain from theſe men, and let them alone.* But ſince I have been inſtructed that pure Methodiſm and Calviniſm are ſynonymous terms, I have wondered ſtill more, that biſhops, who ſometimes through a pardonable humanity, ſometimes ſuffering themſelves to be prevailed upon by the importunity and recommendation of great men, admit youths of very mean abilities, and ſuſpicious morals into the miniſtry, ſhould be ſo determined, as they generally are, to ſet their faces againſt a young man

who has gotten the name, perhaps unjuſtly gotten the name of a Methodiſt. Surely there was a time, when the name of Calviniſt was honourable in this nation. When the divinity chairs in both univerſities were filled with divines of that perſuaſion in the reign of good Queen Elizabeth; and when afterwards King James the Firſt, ſent a biſhop, and three other doctors in divinity of the Church of England to the ſynod at Dort in ſupport of Calviniſm. The heats and violence that prevailed in that ſynod, tended indeed to inſpire our Engliſh divines who went thither, with leſs reverence for the doctrines of Calvin; but they ſigned the decrees of it, though with ſome reſtrictions and limitations. It was a long time however before Calviniſm came to be generally diſcountenanced in the church. Archbiſhop Abbot, who then ſat in your Grace's chair, lived and died a favourer of it. And it was chiefly owing to the adoption and patronage of Arminian principles, that your predeceſſor Laud got the name of Papiſt.

I have no inclination to purſue the hiſtory of thoſe times; nor will I be backward to own, that the puritanical principles which then prevailed, tended, together with many errors in adminiſtration, to overthrow the government

government in church and ſtate. But modern Calviniſm, or Methodiſm is, upon the compariſon an innocent thing. Men may be unhappily miſtaken in their religious principles, without being criminal. Though they charge God fooliſhly, they do it not preſumptuouſly. They mean not to impeach his truth, his juſtice, or his mercy; and charity obliges me to hope, and believe, that the doctrines of election and reprobation, are maintained only out of a falſe and blind zeal to promote the glory of God. Is there then no Chriſtianity in the ſeven united provinces, where Calviniſm is ſtill the eſtabliſhed mode of religion? or is it all center'd among the Arminians? Is there no Chriſtianity among our Scottiſh brethren? Or rather, to come nearer to the buſineſs, which weighs more than any conſideration of religion, are they not obedient ſubjects? There is no danger, at this time of day, that government will be affected by religious diſputes; nor any reaſon to be frightened at the name of Methodiſm. A little tinge of what generally goes by that name, very often gives a zeſt, and a ſpirit in the diſcharge of parochial duties, which is in general but too much wanted; and a deeper ſenſe of religion, and greater ſerioufneſs and ſobriety of conduct, is oftener diffuſed throughout a pa-

riſh

riſh by perſons of this deſcription, than by thoſe who are moſt ready to reproach them with enthuſiaſm.

About a century ago the learned Dr. Prideaux, Dean of Norwich, publiſhed a treatiſe with this title; "The "original and right of tithes for the maintenance of the "miniſtry in a chriſtian church, duly ſtated." To this treatiſe is annexed the draft of a bill prepared to have been offered to the parliament, in the reign of King William and Queen Mary, for the reſtraining of pluralities of benefices with cure of ſouls; with reaſons for the ſaid bill. But the doctor's good intentions came to nothing. They were too pure and diſintereſted, for the age, in which he lived, to adopt.

In the year 1783, the preſent Biſhop of Landaff, with the moſt becoming modeſty, addreſſed a letter to your Grace's predeceſſor, "reſpecting the revenues of the "biſhops and the inferiour clergy; both of them tending "to the ſame end—a better apportioned diſtribution of "what the ſtate allows for the maintenance of the clergy." He ventured to recommend a bill, to render the biſhopricks more equal to each other in point of value, which would

would make biſhops independent in parliament, and promote reſidence in their dioceſes. But though his propoſals have done him immortal honour, no one has had the virtue to ſecond him, and his letter lies neglected on the ſame ſhelf with the Dean's bill. And yet like a corn of wheat fallen into the ground, though it be now dead, it may hereafter ſpring up, and bear much fruit. The calls of ſuch men will not always be ſucceſsfully reſiſted; and an inattention to them is a ſevere ſatire againſt the vigilance of our eccleſiaſtical governors. But whether the ideas of reformation and amendment ariſe from our brethren without, or within the pale of the church, the ſame anſwer is always ready: *We are afraid of innovations.* An argument any man of the leaſt reflection ſhould be aſhamed of, as it is equally calculated to defend every tenet of Popery and Paganiſm.

Tranſlations, commendams, non-reſidence, and pluralities in the church with cure of ſouls, are among the corruptions of Popery, which I truſt will one day be ſwept out of the church. Biſhops, and the parochial clergy, ſhould be equally provided with a maintenance ſuitable to their reſpective ſtations; but no commendam

ſhould

ſhould be allowed the firſt, except an abſolute ſinecure, ſuch as ſhould be conſolidated with the biſhopricks, and never required their attendance out of their dioceſes, in which they ſhould be indiſpenſibly obliged to reſide, with very few exceptions in caſes of emergency. But of all commendams, (if it may be called a commendam) the moſt inconſiſtent with the duty of a biſhop, is that of the government of a college in either of the univerſities. In the conſcientious diſcharge of theſe ſeveral offices, the public is very highly intereſted. They are both of them important and paternal; and cannot be delegated to a ſubſtitute, or deputy, becauſe they are purely perſonal. Every head of a houſe, as far as I underſtand ſuch inſtitutions, is bound by an oath to reſidence, as well as an unremitted attention to the welfare of the ſociety over which he preſides, both in ſpirituals and temporals. Every biſhop engages at his conſecration, to adorn his dioceſe, by ſound doctrine, by good example and charity. When I obſerve therefore a man of acknowledged genius, and learning, and of a general good character for probity and manners, accumulating theſe incompatible preferments, I am ſtaggered, and at a loſs to think, what muſt his ideas be of duty and obligation. Or rather, I am

ſometimes

ſometimes led to condemn my own ideas of both as too rigid, and as neither required in this ſtate of imperfection, nor ſuited to it. But when I have endeavoured to make the beſt apology I can for human infirmity, till ſome new code of morality be promulgated, my old faſhioned notions ſtill recur ſtrongly upon me. However pleaſant and polite the manners of ſuch a man may be, how deep and various his erudition, how laudable ſoever his zeal to defend the purity of the Chriſtian faith, and to adorn it with a ſuitable behaviour, there is a ſecret root of bitterneſs, the love of money, entwining itſelf among theſe ſhining qualities, which overtops them all. *Heu pietas! heu priſca fides!*

As biſhops ſhould not hold commendams, ſo no ſecond preferment with cure of ſouls, ſhould be conferred upon any parochial miniſter. At a certain age they might be made capable of holding beſides, one deanry, canonry, prebend, chancellorſhip, archdeaconry, or ſinecure as a reward of their labours in their reſpective pariſhes, and a comfort to their increaſing years. And in the older foundations in our cathedrals, it might be convenient, that the ſmaller prebends ſhould be conſolidated, ſo as

to make an income worthy the acceptance of a man, who had diſtinguiſhed himſelf as a good pariſh-prieſt. The good effect of ſuch regulations would ſoon become viſible; and I cannot but devoutly wiſh, that an act of parliament were paſſed for theſe purpoſes; not with a deſign to diſturb any man in the enjoyment of what he poſſeſſes, but to new model, and regulate the diſpoſal of all eccleſiaſtical preferments from ſome future day to be named. Upon this plan, the poorer livings will be at leaſt ſerved as well as they uſed to be; and much better, if the truſtees and governors of Queen Ann's bounty, inſtead of locking up a great treaſure in the publick funds, would lay it out as it accumulates, in ſome large eſtate, or eſtates, and apportion them to their augmentation. Whereas the incumbents upon ſuch benefices, are themſelves obliged to look out for purchaſes; which, being for a ſmall ſum, are very difficult to be found; and when they are found, they are haraſſed with innumerable delays, and objections to titles, to their intolerable grievance. If your Grace, and the other truſtees, will condeſcend to take this matter into conſideration, and remedy the evil, many worthy men will be ready to acknowledge

acknowledge themſelves your debtors, and to render due thanks for the bounty.

I will not trouble myſelf to enquire, when the alliance between church and ſtate was ſtricken, or whether it were ever ſtricken at all. Much learning and ingenuity has been employed upon that ſubject to very little purpoſe. It is ſufficient, that there has been a connection between them of very long ſtanding; often, but not always, to the advantage of both. In this nation, during the darkneſs of popery, ſuperſtition and idolatry in the church, and arbitrary power in the ſtate, mutually ſupported each other. The church however was uppermoſt; for the Pope held the King in his fetters, and pillaged the kingdom. When the reformation took place, the King got the precedency, and arbitrary power, and paſſive obedience went hand-in-hand, with little interruption, for a century and a half. At the revolution, the wiſdom of our anceſtors was very cautious of removing land-marks, and deviated as little, as was conſiſtent with the ſafety of the nation, from the knowledge and inherent principles of the conſtitution. But at that glorious period, the weight and importance of the people came

to be acknowledged; and kings were taught, that they had no longer any right to rule, than *quam diu bene ſe geſſerint:* no longer than while they governed according to law, and the obligation of their coronation oath. When civil liberty was thus eſtabliſhed upon its true foundation, if a liberty in ſacred things had kept an even pace with it, church and ſtate would have been knit together, with a cloſer tie than ever; and probably have been joined in an indiſſoluble union. But ſome principles were retained, which, unleſs they are abandoned, will ſooner or later, looſen the connection, notwithſtanding the knot ſeems at preſent to be drawn very cloſe between them.

Dr. Whitchcote in his aphoriſms has juſtly obſerved, that "the more a man's religion is his own, the more "fierce he is for it; but the more it is the religion of "God, the leſs concerned he is for its defence." This is pretty much the caſe of the Church of England. She has been fighting and contending, for this century paſt, to ſupport an offenſive creed, as though the doctrine of the Trinity could not be maintained by the authority of ſcripture; and is ſtill in appearance as zealous for its continuance, as though the being of Chriſtianity depended upon

upon it. But this conduct, if it be perſiſted in, will be her final ſtumbling-block and her bane. The Diſſenters are very well acquainted, with how little ſincerity the Athanaſian mode of faith is adhered to by churchmen in general. Suppoſe therefore, under the pretence of maintaining the church in its purity, and purging it from its ſecret enemies, a bill ſhould be brought into parliament, requiring clergymen of all ranks, from the biſhop to the curate incluſive, annually to ſubſcribe to the belief and uſe of it, in the ſtrongeſt terms that can be invented, under pain of deprivation. With what grace could ſuch an act be oppoſed? Its profeſſed deſign would be, to promote real uniformity, and to prevent hypocriſy. If ſuch a teſt were propoſed, and paſſed, I have ſo juſt an opinion of the good principles of clergymen in general, that I am perſuaded it would thin the right reverend bench; and a more abundant harveſt would be reaped, and a more glorious ſacrifice made to conſcience, than was made on St. Bartholomew's day in the year 1662.

It would be invidious in me to ſay it, the liberal and candid Biſhop of Landaff has ſaid it before me, "there "are many among the pooreſt of the parochial clergy,"

and

and I will add among the Diſſenters alſo, " whoſe merits " as ſcholars, as chriſtians, and as men, would be no diſ- " grace to the moſt deſerving prelate on the bench." Let any man read over the diſtinguiſhed names of Doddridge, Chandler, Foſter, Watts, Lardner, Robertſon, Blair, *Maclaine, and others that might be mentioned, and determine whether Diſſenters have not kept an even pace with churchmen, as virtuous men, able ſcholars and ſound divines. To prevent therefore a ſchiſm in the church, and to conciliate the affections of our diſſenting brethren, I beg leave to repeat that the church ſhould have the dignity to reform itſelf. Some mode of national religion muſt be uppermoſt; and ſome teſt there muſt be to keep Socinians out of the church, who aſſume the name of Chriſtians, but, as they degrade our bleſſed Saviour from his divinity, ſeem to be no other than Deiſts in diſguiſe. There will be weak men, and bigots, among all ſects and denominations of Chriſtians, whom no arguments can divert from pre-conceived

* This gentleman is miniſter of the Engliſh Church at the Hague. He was born our fellow-ſubject, and has refuſed a lucrative dignity, and other preferments in our church. His various and extenſive learning is well known throughout Europe; but he is more eſpecially endeared to the defenders of revelation, by his able and manly critique on *Jenyns's internal evidences of Chriſtianity*.

pre-conceived opinions. But I am perſuaded there is ſcarce an intelligent clergyman in the kingdom, who is not aſhamed of the condemnation of the principles of civil liberty, in the famous convocation of the Univerſity of Oxford, held 21ſt July, 1783. And I am perſuaded likewiſe that there are not many intelligent Diſſenters of any denomination, who have not parted with their Calviniſm, or who make it a matter of conſcience, whether the church be governed by biſhops, preſbyters, or independent paſtors; who are much offended at the ſign of the croſs in baptiſm, or abhor the ſight of a ſurplice as a rag of Popery. Nor is there an intelligent *Baptiſt*, who does not abhor the poſition condemned in the thirty-eighth article of the church, ſaid to be held by certain *Ana-baptiſts*, of which there are ſcarce ten in the kingdom. Time, and experience to how little purpoſe diviſions and animoſities are maintained upon any ſubject, more eſpecially upon that of religion, in all things that are not eſſential, have ſoftened the minds of men towards each other, and taught them that mutual forbearance and reſpect, towards each others opinions, which becomes liberal men and Chriſtians. Many Diſſenters are beſides ſenſible of the decency and propriety of an

eſtabliſhed

eſtabliſhed form of worſhip. "They are melting away "faſt into the boſom of the church," as a celebrated writer of their own acknowledges; but they revolt at offenſive repetitions, and the mixture of different offices, ſuch as is practiſed in the church on litany-days, and on the mornings of every ſunday, and holy-day. But the chief objection of the moſt liberal among them to their joining in church communion is this. They are under the influence of certain honeſt and laudable prejudices of education, which, as things are circumſtanced, they cannot, nor do not wiſh to part with. They have been educated under a virtuous and learned clergy, for whom they have imbibed a juſt reſpect, and whom they ſcorn to abandon, Let the church throw down her offenſive barriers, and give their miniſters an opportunity to make their way conſcientiouſly to the eſtabliſhed preferments, in proportion to their merits, and a valuable body of men, headed by their clergy, would ſoon join the preſent eſtabliſhment, and give it ſuch a durability and conſiſtency, as no adverſe power could reſiſt with any probability of ſucceſs. Men of this ſtamp do not join in the ſenſeleſs cry of a profanation of the holy communion, becauſe it is made the teſt of conformity to the doctrine of the liturgy

liturgy of the Church of England. If the holy communion be profaned, it is profaned only by occaſional conformiſts themſelves, who proſtitute their conſciences for worldly honour, or filthy lucre's ſake; and outwardly join in a worſhip, which in their hearts they abhor. Such men are a diſgrace to every ſect. Diſſenters of a truly liberal and chriſtian ſpirit, wiſh to unite with the church cordially, or not at all; but they never can unite with it till the terms of her communion are enlarged.

The workings of Providence in the neighbouring nations, ſhould teach us to labour after the eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity upon the pureſt principles. The hand of God is viſibly upon the high dignitaries of France. The affairs of that nation indeed ſtill hang in awful ſuſpenſe; but it ſeems evident, that the great and powerful ſtructure of ſuperſtition, the work of ages, is falling to pieces. In proportion as the fabrick of human contrivance is brought to nought, that of divine wiſdom will be more firmly grounded and eſtabliſhed. It is ſurprizing how much the human underſtanding has been held in fetters, and what great ignorance and error prevail to this day, in the moſt fundamental principles of religion. Chriſti-

anity is yet a doctrine of damnation among the Papiſts. A man may confeſs, and receive abſolution in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, but ſtill the whole buſineſs is to come over again, and no merit allowed to the atonement, till it is more powerfully ſeconded by the prayers of the prieſt in the ſacrifice of the maſs. Thus is the purity of religion ſophiſticated, and garbled by the doctrine of purgatory; the boldeſt and moſt gainful impoſition ever practiced againſt mankind. Proteſtants have ſhaken off this abſurdity; but are yet *fools and ſlow of heart to believe* the eſſential doctrines of revelation. Neither the fall of man, nor his redemption from the evils of it, are yet generally well underſtood. No words can convey a clearer meaning than the ſentence, "*in the day thou "eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die;*" nor can there be a clearer reverſal of it than the gracious declaration, "*as in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made "alive.*" But the bold preſumption of man would make God a liar; conſign to death that which never had life, and live without Chriſt in a ſeparate ſtate from the body, which is an eſſential part of his nature. Volumes however of ingenious ſophiſtry, and human reaſoning, can never invalidate the ſentence, nor this clear aſſurance of

the

the inſpired Apoſtle, that all mankind ſhall finally obtain ſalvation in Chriſt alone, which aſſurance he repeats in terms equally clear in many other parts of his epiſtles. The argument, that ſin deſerves an infinite puniſhment becauſe it is committed againſt an infinite Being, ſuits very well with the jargon and darkneſs of ſchool divinity, but will not ſtand examination. If indeed by infinite puniſhment be meant annihilation, that *was* the puniſhment God denounced againſt ſin. But if infinite torment be meant, it is ſurely inconſiſtent with every idea of juſtice, and mercy to imagine, that a juſt and merciful God will puniſh a frail creature eternally, in the full ſenſe of the term, for crimes committed in the ſhort ſpace of human life. It is an affront to his Majeſty, and a contradiction to his holy Word rightly underſtood, to entertain ſuch a thought. The only pretence for eſtabliſhing ſuch a horrid doctrine is, that God has promiſed his mercy, and denounced his threatenings in terms of equal import; and therefore if happineſs is to be eternal, puniſhment muſt be eternal likewiſe. But though it be true, that the terms are the ſame, the conſequence does not follow. Every one at all ſkilled in the Greek language knows, that αἰων, age, and αἰωνιος, eval, improperly everlaſting, do not

convey the ideas of a proper eternity. They mean a definite ſpace of time, be that ſpace longer, or ſhorter, and known to God alone. The correſpondent Hebrew word, *olam*, which has no adjective, has the ſame ſignification. Now though the truth and juſtice of God will not inflict a leſs puniſhment upon ſinful man than he has threatened, his mercy may very conſiſtently beſtow upon his obedience a greater reward than he has promiſed to it, even prolonged to a proper eternity, according to our moſt extended idea of the term. In his judgments upon earth, he ſometimes, and in ſome particular caſes by unavoidable conſequence *viſits the ſins of fathers upon their children, to the third and fourth generation of them that hate him;* but *ſheweth mercy unto thouſands in them that love him.* There is analogy enough between the two caſes, to illuſtrate the different operations of juſtice and mercy; though it muſt be underſtood, that one man ſhall never, in a future life, ſhare the puniſhment of another. In the allegorical language of the prophet, "*the* "*fathers* upon earth *eat ſour grapes and ſet their children's* "*teeth on edge.*" But in the next world it is not ſo, nor juſt that it ſhould be ſo. "*There the ſon ſhall not bear* "*the iniquity of the father, neither ſhall the father bear the* "*iniquity*

" *iniquity of the ſon. The righteouſneſs of the righteous* " *ſhall be upon him, and the wickedneſs of the wicked ſhall* " *be upon him.*"

Let no man be afraid, that God will not make his threatenings good, or think it a light thing, upon this ſuppoſition, to undergo the puniſhment prepared for the incorrigibly wicked. He will puniſh with the ſeverity of his wrath, from age to age, for a longer or ſhorter time, all the ungodly, till he has brought every action. and every thought of their hearts into a perfect ſubjection to his will and government. But that Chriſt died, that he might reſtore the fallen nature of man, and bring him back to the happineſs, for which God from eternity deſigned him, is a doctrine which no man can attempt to diſannul without blaſphemy. This is the εὐαγγελιον, the glad tidings peculiar to the goſpel. " *By man came death, by* " *man came alſo the reſurrection of the dead. For as in* " *Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.*" But " *every man in his own order ;*" every man according as he ſhall be prepared for it, whether by an acceptable obedience in this life, or in ſome future ſtate of further trial, at preſent concealed from us. The great work

cannot

cannot be performed all at once, on account of the different degrees and malignity in ſin. "*Chriſt the firſt* "*fruits, afterwards*" in their ſeveral order, "*they that* "*are Chriſt's;*" that is all mankind, whom he came to redeem; which redemption will be compleated, at his coming to his final judgment and victory over all the enemies of God, and death the laſt of them; when he ſhall give up the mediatorial kingdom, which he received from his Father, "*that God may be all in all.*"*

The common interpretations of ſcripture place this doctrine in a quite different light; and as far as they do ſo, disfigure the ſimplicity of it. They are the words of our bleſſed Saviour himſelf, "*God ſent not his Son into* "*the world to condemn the world, but that the world* "*through him might be ſaved.*" Hath God ſaid then, and ſhall he not do it, or *hath he ſpoken, and ſhall he not make it good?* He hath given commandment to bleſs, and to ſave mankind, and all the malice, and power of hell cannot reverſe it.

And

* This doctrine of the final ſalvation of all men, has been maintained by ſeveral able divines; particularly by the learned and ingenious Dr. Thomas Burnet, in the laſt century; and by the late Dr. Newton, Biſhop of Briſtol, in the preſent. By this teſtimony they have done due honour to revelation. I preſume to follow them at an humble diſtance.

And now ſome buſy trifler, ſome curious inquirer after news may probably be ſolicitous to know, who this obſcure man is, that preſumes to write to your Grace on theſe ſubjects; and puzzle himſelf to find out the motives for his conduct, and perhaps hit upon every motive rather than the true one. But if I may be permitted to ſpeak for myſelf, and if I know myſelf at all, I have no other motive in what I have written, than an humble deſire to promote the cauſe of virtue and true religion, by keeping the ſources of education pure and uncorrupt, and by exhorting the miniſters of the goſpel of all ranks, to adorn their profeſſion, by a regular and conſcientious diſcharge of the duties incumbent upon them. The order of biſhops, prieſts and deacons eſtabliſhed in the church is comely, and apoſtolical; and the civil privileges and dignity attached by the ſtate to the higheſt order, reflects honour upon religion, when properly uſed, as well as upon the individual upon whom they are conferred. But there is great danger of their being abuſed, and perverted to ſecular purpoſes. I wiſh not to ſee the epiſcopal dignity lowered in any reſpect. A venerable parent was never weary of reading Biſhop Beveridge's works, and he inſpired me with an early veneration for the name and office. But there is one in that venerable order whoſe memory

mory above all others, I ſhall ever love and cheriſh to my lateſt breath. Hail, immortal Ken,* guide of my youthful ſteps! Thy bounty never ceaſed to feed the poor, nor thy tongue to inſtruct the ignorant. Thy preſence, or thy ſpirit continually pervaded all parts of thy extenſive dioceſe. It illuminated her churches, and darted comfort through the chearleſs gloom of her priſons. To the ſanctity of thy character the profligate CHARLES ſubmitted upon his death-bed. To thy virtue the Genius of England bowed in the tower. To thy unbounded and perſuaſive generoſity, and charity, the ſecond ſucceſſor in thy biſhoprick greatly owed his acceptance of it. *Receive*, ſaid the good old man to his friend, *receive the ſee, with as good a conſcience as I have quitted it.* Hail, gentle, bleſſed ſpirit! For thy ſake may the mitre for ever flouriſh! And curſed be the hand that ever plucks it from a brow like thine!

I am,

My Lord,

Your Grace's

Moſt obedient ſervant,

A COUNTRY CLERGYMAN.

* Ken's Manual.

POSTSCRIPT.

IT is a conſideration not very honourable to human nature, that whenever any queſtions of moment are brought forward to the public eye, the generality of perſons do not ſo much concern themſelves about their importance, as concerning the mover of them. But ſo it has been, and ſo I preſume it ever will be. *Quis homo hic?* is a queſtion upon record of near two thouſand years ſtanding, and perhaps was aſked two thouſand years before that. This is a conſideration beneath your Grace; but to gratify in ſome meaſure the curioſity which has been excited upon this occaſion, I have given my name to a few virtuous friends, from whom it may get into circulation among others of their own ſtamp, which indeed will confine it to a narrow circle. But what ſatisfaction will the herd of *triflers* obtain from this ſource? As they are a quick-ſcented race, I will enter into ſome further explanation; and (tho' it be a

diſagreeable taſk,) deſcribe myſelf by ſome negative, and poſitive qualities; and when they have hunted me down, I will defy them to contradict by any evidence, or probability of evidence, the truth of what I ſhall ſay. In the firſt place, I know not what envy, malice, or ill will towards my fellow creatures are. I am not, in any ſenſe of the word, uncharitable. I am not ill tempered. I am not inhoſpitable, unſocial, or unfriendly. I am not wholly unconverſant in polite life. I think I am not ill-bred. Theſe are my negative qualities. My poſitive ones are, a love of order, and ſubjection to lawful government. A thankfulneſs to God for the bleſſings I enjoy, and an attention to the duties of my ſtation. I am an honeſt man; and tho' I dare not call myſelf a virtuous one, I have been ſteadily, ſincerely, and uniformly a lover of Virtue from my youth.

If I am not known by theſe features, nine hundred ninety and nine perſons out of a thouſand, even among my neighbours, muſt remain ignorant of me. I would not have endeavoured to conceal myſelf at all, but for one reaſon, which I will openly avow. I had rather *be* than *appear to be* a particularly conſcientious Clergyman

gyman. It is a moſt invidious thing, to appear to have a greater regard to duty than one's neighbour.

If any one ſhall unjuſtly think, that I have taken unwarrantable liberties with any man, or body of men, I think I have a right to be believed, when I affirm, that I abhor all perſonalities. Corruption is my quarry where-ever I find it, and I have taken no more liberties with any man, or condemned the practice of any man, more than I have condemned my own. I, who ſay that tranſlations, commendams and pluralities in the Church with cure of ſouls, are among the corruptions of Popery, do not ſcruple to profeſs, that I am myſelf a pluraliſt. Why I retain two benefices with cure of ſouls under ſuch a profeſſion, is beſt known to God, and my own conſcience. But I have many years ago declared publickly, that if I could be happy enough to ſee an act of parliament paſs, to prevent ſuch pluralities in future, I would immediately, and with pleaſure reſign the preferment, on which I do not reſide. If any man therefore among the numerous pluraliſts in this country of all ranks, will ſtand forth and ſay, that he deſires to be conſidered only as *locum-tenens* to ſimilar preferments, till he is aſſured, by the authority

of Parliament, that they ſhall never fall again into a like channel, that man will owe me thanks for co-operating with his deſires to promote a reformation. But if there be a general deadneſs upon this ſubject; if *the God of this world has* ſo *blinded the eyes* of men, that they cannot ſee, and acknowledge, that the accumulation of preferments is a corruption, continued by cuſtom and practice, derived from our popiſh anceſtors, it is TRUTH that rebukes them, and not I. I once thought that the more preferments I could gain, the more reſpectable I ſhould be, and the more enabled to do good. But I have ſome years ſince diſcovered, that I have too many preferments already of a particular kind; and to ſpeak without hypocriſy or affectation, for which in any cauſe, and particularly in the preſent, I know I ſhould be ſeverely accountable, I ſhall be heartily glad fairly to get rid of one of them, on the terms I have mentioned. Such a loſs of income would probably break down my chariot-wheels, but would not deprive me of one domeſtic comfort. It would not make me leſs reſpectable in my own eyes, nor in the eyes of any man whoſe good opinion was worth regarding. It would not make me leſs attentive, according to my ability, to the wants

of

of my poor neighbours; and it would afford me leiſure to attend, with leſs diſtraction, to the particular duties of my ſtation.

Reformation in religion has been attempted with more or leſs imperfection in all proteſtant countries. But tho' I am ſincerely, and from principle attached to epiſcopacy, no national church has taken ſo little care for the decent adminiſtration of the offices of religion, as the Church of England. The Church of Scotland, the Helvetic Churches, and particularly the Eſtabliſhed Churches of the ſeven United Provinces all exceed her in this reſpect. In them no miniſter is ſuffered to have more than one pariſh. In the Seven Provinces, of which I am enabled to ſpeak more particularly by my friendſhip with a native, and for many years a reſident of that country, on whoſe acquaintance with thoſe matters I can depend, the ſtate maintains the miniſters of the Engliſh, Scotch, and Walloon churches, with comfort, and even with dignity. No Church, except where the congregation is ſo ſmall as to require but one ſervice every Sunday, is without two Paſtors, with ſalaries entirely independent on the people, and amounting from

ſeventeen

ſeventeen hundred to two thouſand florins each; that is, from about one hundred and ſeventy, to two hundred pounds ſterling a year; with a comfortable proviſion for ſurviving widows. Some of theſe churches, where the congregations are large, and where there is moſt duty to be done, have three or four miniſters with equal ſalaries, and ſometimes an aſſiſtant; as is particularly the caſe with the French church at Rotterdam. The Dutch eſtabliſhed churches are maintained in a like honourable manner, with ſalaries proportioned to the extent of the pariſhes, and the duty to be performed. But then the eſtabliſhed religion is Calviniſm, the worſt mode of all religions; and notwithſtanding all ſects are allowed the free and open exerciſe of their particular mode of worſhip, which has been ſo much boaſted of in England; no Papiſt, Mennonite or Anabaptiſt, no Arminian, or Quaker, is capable of enjoying any office in the ſtate.

How, on the contrary, is the decent adminiſtration of the offices of religion provided for in this country? Here a man of high or fortunate connections may hold, together with two rich rectories, (for a proportionable

reſidence

reſidence upon each of which, he gives a nugatory bond to the Archbiſhop of the province, which is mere waſte paper, he may hold) a headſhip of a college, (the care of which is equal to that of a biſhopric) a deanry, prebend, ſinecure, a third rectory, voidable, but not void, (if it be worth his keeping) or in ſhort, as many of theſe latter kinds of preferment as he has intereſt to procure. This is a groſs and melancholy fragment of popery; and will call a reflecting mind, to the period when it prevailed in this country; and to the enormous liſt of preferments hiſtorians give us, as held by many great churchmen, and by Cardinal Wolſey in particular. At this period however, the number of great pluraliſts capable of marketing with the miniſter for a biſhopric is comparatively ſmall; but there are many, who live in a conſiderable degree of ſplendor chiefly upon church revenues; and to maintain this, ſome of them, far be it from me to ſay all, becauſe I know to the contrary, ſome of them I ſay, are in a manner obliged to cramp their ſubſtitutes in their ſalaries. In proportion as their Principals accumulate dignities, this moſt unhappy race of men are obliged, in order to procure bread, to accumulate curacies. It is diſtreſſing to the laſt degree to ſee a wor-

thy

thy man enter the deſk covered with ſweat, duſt or dirt, according to the ſeaſon, deranged in his dreſs thro' haſte, wiping by neceſſity his boots with his ſurplice, which is often for want of change or attention, already indecently dirty. Such figures, with great compunction of heart, I once ſaw during a viſit in the county of Norfolk. And ſuch, I am afraid, are too frequently to be found in every county in England.

Theſe indecencies, and abuſes, can never be regulated but by an act of parliament, which it will reflect honour on your Grace, and the reſt of the right reverend bench to promote.

Of equal importance is it to regulate the ſubſcription to the Articles of the Church, and to new model the Articles themſelves. Whence comes it, that ſo many clergymen of reputation revolt againſt theſe Articles in their riper years, but that they have been intrapt into a predilection for them, before they knew the meaning of them, and ſometimes into a ſubſcription to them, before they knew what they did? I ſpeak not at random, but from my own experience and obſervation. When I firſt

went

went to the Univerſity of Oxford, as ſoon as I was furniſhed with my proper habiliments, my Tutor ſaid to me, "come, you ſhall go with me this morning to be matriculated." I went with him therefore to the Convocation-Houſe; and as ſoon as the Vice Chancellor was at liberty, I was ordered to write my name and quality in a large book, and took the oath of ſupremacy, &c. I had no other idea of what I had done, than that I had inrolled myſelf as a member of the Univerſity. But as ſoon as I had paid my fees, a certificate was put into my hands, which told me I had ſubſcribed the Articles. As I returned, I obſerved this to my Tutor. "I find, Sir, ſaid I, "that I have ſubſcribed the Articles."—"Oh, aye, re-"plied he, I had forgotten to mention it, but you are "well acquainted with them." The truth is, I had been educated at a ſchool, where the Sunday exerciſe of a part of the year was, in the lower claſſes, to repeat one or more of the Articles in engliſh, in a higher to tranſlate them into latin, in a higher ſtill into greek. I had gone thro' this tontine, and my Tutor, who had been educated at the ſame ſchool, had done the ſame. I believe the generality of youth in my time, ſubſcribed them in equal ignorance. Many, at the taking of their reſpec-

tive Degrees, now ſubſcribe, with a previous reſolution not to conform to them.

To my early familiarity with a form of words, Articles which I did not then underſtand, tho' I thought I did together with a natural and ſtrong diſpoſition to do always what I thought right, and a diffidence in my own judgment, I owe my late emancipation from the Athanaſian mode of faith. I had very early fallen in love with the creed, as a moſt ingenious compoſition: and though ſcruples would now and then obtrude themſelves about it, I thought I had effectually ſilenced them; and I can truly ſay, that long ſince I have been in poſſeſſion of my preſent preferments, I conſcientiouſly uſed it, and occaſionally preached upon it. But from a more accurate examination into its merits, from maturer reflection, and more grace, I truſt, working in me, I fell firſt into a diſlike, and then into a total diſuſe of it. As I know I am hereby liable to a proſecution in the Eccleſiaſtical courts for non-conformity, your Grace will not wonder, that I deſire to keep out of the way of it. But whether in, or out of the Church, I will not ceaſe to admoniſh perſons in Authority, how they lay ſnares and ſtumbling-

blocks

blocks in the way of ingenuous youth; I mean the ſupine, ſmooth viſitors of colleges, and other eccleſiaſtical governors—who *ſew pillows to all arm-holes*, and in ſpite of common ſenſe, and in flat contradiction to their oaths, and the moſt ſolemn adjurations, authorize, and partake in ſuch practices, as were forbidden even by our latitudinarian popiſh predeceſſors. But corruption is of a ſubtile inſinuating nature. I have ſome in my eye, who from motives of conſcience, as it appeared, reſiſted its firſt eſtabliſhment, and afterwards when it was eſtabliſhed, pleaded conſcience for obeying it. Such is the nature of corruption in general. So it has been of old, and ſo probably it will be to the end of time. *One*, upon a falſe foundation and with rotten materials, *builds up a wall; and lo! others daub it with untempered mortar.*

An alarming conſideration is yet behind. A late Miniſter of State, has recently intimated in the Houſe of Lords, his fears of a national bankruptcy. It is what the fears of many thinking men have anticipated before. The preſent Miniſter, if I am not miſinformed, has lately obſcurely intimated the ſame thing in the Houſe of Commons. He called it "a diſtreſsful, though a remote

" criſis, which he hoped by a diſagreeable effort to avert." May Heaven avert every evil from this country! But the moſt diſtant apprehenſion of the evil alluded to, is terrifying. The Patriots of France have eſtabliſhed the Rights of Man, but have violated thoſe of individuals in the moſt illegal and unprecedented manner. Theſe gentlemen have no Chriſtianity; they are a ſet of Philoſophers. They have an *eſoteric* and *exoteric* religion; one for the enlightened, and another for the vulgar. Accordingly while they have trampled under foot the great eccleſiaſtics of the kingdom, and pared their revenues to the quick, they have ſo provided for the maintenance of the popular ſuperſtition, as to benefit nine out of ten of the parochial clergy. It is indeed a moſt awful diſpenſation. And can all theſe changes have happened with ſo little bloodſhed, without the permiſſion at leaſt of Providence? Your Grace will ſurely be the laſt to think ſo. Let this Revolution then, new, and unſettled as it may appear, be a leſſon to Engliſh divines, to prepare wiſely againſt a ſtorm.

— tua res agitur, pariës cum proximus ardet.

I ſhall not wonder, my Lord, if, from this caution, I ſhall be

be charged with inviting ſedition. I may be told that this is not the time to move queſtions of ſuch a magnitude, when our brethren in Scotland, and our Roman Catholic brethren are diſcontented, and ſoliciting freſh indulgences, to the danger, as it is apprehended, of the Church of England. But, my Lord, if the Church of England is, and has long been afraid of alterations and innovations, will her fears remove the danger one jot the further off? Fear is a bad counſellor. I am not one of her ſons, any more than I am a ſon of ſedition. Let the Church of England, *put off the armour ſhe cannot go with*, and let her meet, like David, her enemies *with a ſling and with a ſtone;* with the Goſpel weapons of Truth and Charity. With theſe, and theſe only can ſhe be victorious.

Our bleſſed Saviour has foretold that the gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt his church. But in the myſtical book of the Revelation, *antichriſt*, and the *great whore*, which learned interpreters by infallible marks have, determined to be the Pope and Roman Church, are deſcribed as blaſpheming Chriſt and corrupting his religion, during the ſpace of forty and two months; amounting, according to the prophetic language, to twelve hundred

and

and ſixty years. But in nothing has this church ſo much diſfigured and diſguiſed the purity of religion, as in the account ſhe gives of the puniſhments denounced in it. Having ſet a price upon every ſin, and made a merchandize of the ſouls of men, ſhe took care to interpret ſcripture in ſuch a manner, as to continue, or ſhorten the torments of purgatory at her pleaſure. When Luther, by divine Providence, aroſe to enlighten a benighted world, he ſoon vindicated the honour of God, in this and other particulars; and proved inconteſtably that it was his prerogative alone to puniſh or forgive ſin. As a means to forward the great reformation he had begun, he tranſlated the Bible into his native tongue. As I have no knowledge of the German language, I cannot be anſwerable for the faithfulneſs of that tranſlation. I can ſuſpect any thing rather than his ability, or integrity; but if, coming out of the Church of Rome with the thunder of eternal damnation in his ears, he did not immediately recover from the ſtupor, and has at all leaned to a tranſlation like the Engliſh, he has ſo far weakened the foundation of that evangelical religion, to which he firſt pointed the way, and claims our candid indulgence. The ſame apology may be offered for our firſt Engliſh tranſlators; and they who

have

have ſtill continued to follow them, have been trepanned into the ſame capital errors, by the authority of great names, by cuſtom and example. Nothing can be clearer, than that the terms *for an age, from age to age, from ages to ages,* do not denote *eternity.* Now who ſhall pretend to determine the ſpace of *an age?* There are evident proofs in ſcripture that it means different periods, in different places. Or who ſhall pretend to determine, in what manner, or through how many different ſtates of exiſtence, it ſhall pleaſe God to puniſh from age to age, or from ages to ages, the ungodly, whom he will reduce to his obedience, by the frequent experience they will have had, how much they have been their own enemies, in reſiſting his juſt commands? The abſolute eternity of hell-torments is maintained upon the beſt ground, by a miſtaken zeal for the glory of God, but much oftener by a ſupine contented ignorance, by ſpiritual pride, and uncharitableneſs.

Religion being thus corrupted, more or leſs, in every chriſtian ſtate, it has driven thinking perſons in popiſh countries, generally into Deiſm. Where it has not that effect, as in our own country, THE CONSCIENCE OF moſt SINNERS BEARS WITNESS TO THE TRUTH

OF

OF GOD; and they generally expreſs hope in their death, that however it may pleaſe God to puniſh them, they ſhall finally be ſaved.

To a give firm foundation to this hope, is the duty of every miniſter of the goſpel. And this can only be done, by aſſuring ſinners, that *God will have all men to be ſaved.* And that the longer they refuſe to co-operate with his grace, the longer and ſorer their puniſhment will be. Whereas to denounce that there is no medium between being eternally ſaved, and eternally damned, is to drive many into deſpair, or to make them preſume that God will be more merciful than to make good his threatenings; which is in other words, to make him a liar.

Learned men differ with reſpect to the commencement of the twelve hundred and ſixty years; ſome placing it in the fifth, others in the ſeventh century. From the ſigns of the times, the latter ſeems the ſoundeſt interpretation. The power of the Pope is greatly fallen, and diminiſhing every day, but it is not yet abſolutely extinct. When his *blaſphemies, and the ſorceries of the great whore* are at an end, religion will appear in its native ſplendor.

1 AP 57

The

The witneſſes which have ariſen, and will ariſe to give their teſtimony to the TRUTH, will uſher it in with the acclamations of all good men; and Chriſt ſhall reign with his ſaints, that is, Chriſtianity ſhall be profeſſed with greater purity than ever it had been before, for a long ſeaſon, for a thouſand years.

While Providence is preparing for this great event, may the Church of England qualify herſelf to become one of the happy inſtruments in it! May ſhe *come out of the abominations* contracted in the Church of Rome, from which ſhe has never yet been ſufficiently purged! Her worſhip, with a few exceptions, is I am perſuaded, the pureſt of that of any church ſubſiſting, at this day, in the chriſtian world. May it be carried on to the degree of perfection it yet wants, and is capable of attaining! When it ſhall thus ſtand equally purified, and diſtinguiſhed from all papal and puritan innovations, ESTO PERPETUA, will be the devout prayer of all her true ſons.

FINIS.

1 AP 57